

To: Gray, David[gray.david@epa.gov]; Ostrander, David[Ostrander.David@epa.gov]; Ruhl, Christopher[Ruhl.Christopher@epa.gov]
From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Tue 9/8/2015 11:02:31 PM
Subject: FW: Additional constituent testing language

-----Original Message-----

From: Brooks, Becky
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 6:37 PM
To: Grantham, Nancy
Subject: RE: Additional constituent testing language

This is what is in the Qs:

14. Adding constituent testing of source water at GKM?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

PCBs - Mine was closed in 1922. PCBs were introduced in 1928.

Dioxins - Dioxins are formed through a combustion process. It is not expected that there were combustion process within the mine.

Cyanide - Cyanide is used in the processing of ore. For the time period, EPA does not believe that cyanide was used nor would it have been used inside the mine.

Uranium - CDPHE conducted sediment and surface water samples and analyzed them Uranium. Results of that sampling indicated that levels do not pose a risk.

Nitrogen compounds - CDPHE conducted surface water samples and analyzed them for nitrates. Results of that sampling indicated that levels do not pose a risk.

Chromium speciation - Chromium is currently being tested. Speciation is normally done to identify Hex Chrome which is generally a man-made product. Hex chrome was not being produced during the time period that the mine was in operation.

Organics (volatile and semi) - Organic compounds are not believed to have existed at the mine in quantities that would continue to pose a threat.

Becky Brooks

Special Assistant

Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ph. 202-566-2762

-----Original Message-----

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 5:57 PM
To: Brooks, Becky
Subject: FW: Additional constituent testing language

Can we give you a call? Best number? Thanks ng

-----Original Message-----

From: Gray, David

Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 4:48 PM

To: Stanislaus, Mathy

Cc: Grantham, Nancy; Ruhl, Christopher; Ostrander, David; McGrath, Shaun; Card, Joan; Breen, Barry

Subject: RE: Additional constituent testing language

Draft -

Q. Adding constituent testing of source water at GKM?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

-----Original Message-----

From: Stanislaus, Mathy

Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 2:17 PM

To: Gray, David

Cc: Grantham, Nancy; Ruhl, Christopher; Ostrander, David; McGrath, Shaun; Card, Joan; Breen, Barry

Subject: Re: Additional constituent testing language

Thanks - please revise and send thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Sep 8, 2015, at 4:01 PM, Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov> wrote:

>

> Agree. Without some current data - the question will remain unanswerable for leaders trying to help us address citizen concerns.

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Grantham, Nancy

> Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 1:59 PM

> To: Stanislaus, Mathy; Ruhl, Christopher

> Cc: Ostrander, David; McGrath, Shaun; Card, Joan; Gray, David; Breen,

> Barry

> Subject: RE: Additional constituent testing language

>

> Hi Mathy,

>

> From a communities and elected official perspective, it would be good to know through a data set or two ..that the source (mine) does not contain these toxins, which is what the community is looking for. This additional data would help in the long term plan by closing discussion with other downstream communities as well.

>

> We can revise the message below to include the perspective above.

>

> Thanks

>

> ng

>

>

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Stanislaus, Mathy
> Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 3:52 PM
> To: Ruhl, Christopher
> Cc: Ostrander, David; Grantham, Nancy; McGrath, Shaun; Card, Joan
> Subject: Re: Additional constituent testing language
>
> The high level answers seems incomplete per our conversation yesterday. I believe we were talking about some high-level talking points along the lines we will continue to engage in discussions to determine whether other constituents should be tested or not given the history of the mining operations and materials used in the mines.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
>> On Sep 8, 2015, at 3:22 PM, Ruhl, Christopher <Ruhl.Christopher@epa.gov> wrote:
>>
>> Mathy-
>>
>> Here is our message that we have prepared.
>>
>> Question: La Plata County has requested an additional suite of chemicals to be sampled from the source of the release.
>>

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

>> Additional discussion:
>>
>> Current EPA testing parameters are consistent with prior EPA and non EPA assessments of the Animas River.
>>
>> PCBs - Mine was closed in 1922. PCBs were introduced in 1928.
>> Dioxins - Dioxins are formed through a combustion process. It is not expected that there were combustion process within the mine.
>> Cyanide - Cyanide is used in the processing of ore. For the time period, EPA does not believe that cyanide was used nor would it have been used inside the mine.
>> Uranium - CDPHE conducted sediment and surface water samples and analyzed them Uranium. Results of that sampling indicated that levels do not pose a risk.
>> Nitrogen compounds - CDPHE conducted surface water samples and analyzed them for nitrates. Results of that sampling indicated that levels do not pose a risk.
>> Chromium speciation - Chromium is currently being tested. Speciation is normally done to identify Hex Chrome which is generally a man made product. Hex chrome was not being produced during the time period that the mine was in operation.
>> Organics (volatile and semi) - Organic compounds are not believed to have existed at the mine in quantities that would continue to pose a threat.
>>
>> Chris Ruhl
>> USEPA R6 Oil Team Leader
>> Federal On Scene Coordinator
>> (214) 665-7356 office
>>
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Stanislaus, Mathy
>> Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 1:18 PM
>> To: Ostrander, David
>> Cc: Grantham, Nancy; McGrath, Shaun; Card, Joan; Ruhl, Christopher
>> Subject: Additional constituent testing language
>>
>> David: where are we on this?
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone